

Decision \_\_\_\_\_

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Order Instituting Rulemaking Pursuant to Assembly Bill 2514 to Consider the Adoption of Procurement Targets for Viable and Cost-Effective Energy Storage Systems. | Rulemaking 10-12-007<br>(Filed December 16, 2010)□ |
|---|--|

**DECISION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO CLEAN COALITION FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 13-10-040**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Claimant: CLEAN COALITION</b>             | <b>For contribution to Decision (D.) 13-10-040</b>          |
| <b>Claimed: \$42,697.00</b>                  | <b>Awarded: \$34,706.50 (approximately 18.7% reduction)</b> |
| <b>Assigned Commissioner: Carla Peterman</b> | <b>Assigned ALJ: Colette Kersten and Amy Yip-Kikugawa</b>   |

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>A. Brief Description of Decision:</b> | This decision establishes the policies and mechanisms for procurement of electric energy storage pursuant to Assembly Bill 2514. |
|--|--|

**B. Claimant must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812:**

|   | <b>Claimant</b>                     | <b>CPUC Verified</b> |
|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| <b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):</b> |                                     |                      |
| 1. Date of Prehearing Conference:   | September 04, 2012                  | Correct              |
| 2. Other Specified Date for NOI:  |                                     |                      |
| 3. Date NOI Filed:  | 10/4/2012                           | Correct              |
| 4. Was the NOI timely filed?  |                                     | Yes                  |
| <b>Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):</b>                |                                     |                      |
| 5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:                               |                                     |                      |
| 6. Date of ALJ ruling:  |                                     |                      |
| 7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):                                 | D.13-12-021/D.13-12-023 (both dated | Correct              |

|   |  |                                |
|---|--|--------------------------------|
|   | 12/5/13)                                     |                                |
| 8. Has the Claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status? |  | Yes                            |
| <b>Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):</b>       |  |                                |
| 9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:                   |  |                                |
| 10. Date of ALJ ruling:   |  |                                |
| 11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):                    | D.13-12-021/D.13-12-023 (both dated 12/5/13) | Correct. See also D.12-09-014. |
| 12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?     |  | Yes                            |
| <b>Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b>                   |  |                                |
| 13. Identify Final Decision:  | D.13-10-040                                  | Correct                        |
| 14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:                      | 10/21/2013 <input type="checkbox"/>          | Correct                        |
| 15. File date of compensation request:                                | 12/19/13                                     | Correct                        |
| 16. Was the request for compensation timely?                          |  | Yes                            |

## PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. In the fields below, describe in a concise manner Claimant’s contribution to the final decision (*see* § 1802(i), § 1803(a) & D.98-04-059).

| Contribution   | Specific References to Claimant’s Presentations and to Decision   | Showing Accepted by CPUC |
|--|---|--------------------------|
| Contribution   | Citation to Decision or Record  |                          |
| <p>The Clean Coalition is submitting this claim for contributions to D.13-10-040 in the energy storage proceeding.</p> <p>We submitted the following comments in this proceeding, with the date of submission specified:</p> <p>Use Case Submission and Workshop Participation, October 2012</p> <p>Clean Coalition Opening Comments on Interim Staff Report and Energy Storage Workshops, dated February 4<sup>th</sup>, 2013</p> | <p>Comments in <i>italics</i> in this column are the Clean Coalition’s brief explanation of our argument and the Commission’s resolution of that argument. We have also highlighted in yellow where the Clean Coalition is mentioned by name.</p> | Verified                 |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Clean Coalition Reply Comments on the Phase 2 Interim Staff Report and Energy Storage Workshops, dated February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2013</p> <p>Clean Coalition Opening Comments on Assigned Commissioners Ruling, dated July 3, 2013</p> <p>Clean Coalition Opening Comments on Proposed Decision, dated September 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2013</p> <p>Clean Coalition Reply Comments on Proposed Decision, dated September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2013</p>  |   |  |
| <p><b><u>D.13-10-040</u></b></p> <p>This decision adopted an energy storage procurement framework and design program for the investor-owned utilities.</p> <p><b><i>Adding teeth to the procurement framework</i></b></p> <p>The Clean Coalition argued in opening comments on the PD:</p> <p>“The Clean Coalition feels that additional teeth are required, however, to ensure that the storage procurement targets are met. As is, the language in the PD is too weak (pp. 40-41): ‘We remind the IOUs that while we may grant a request to defer a portion of their procurement targets, we expect that the cumulative procurement goals will be met by 2020. If the goals are not met at that time, we will consider whether the target date to achieve the MW goals should be extended past 2020.’ Combined with the off-ramps provided in the PD, it seems likely that the</p> | <p><i>The Clean Coalition argued that allowing overly-easy deferral of the IOU procurement targets constituted bad policy. We also argued that the lack of a hard deadline for meeting procurement targets was a serious flaw in the proposed decision. The Commission agreed with our second point but disagreed with our first point.</i></p> <p>The Final Decision adds a requirement that all storage projects must be procured and onlined by 2024, a requirement that was missing in the PD. This requirement is stated in a number of places and was not present in the PD. For example, p. 37 states: “We remind the IOUs that while we may grant a request to defer a portion of their procurement targets, we expect that the overall procurement goal of 1,325 MW will be installed by 2024.”</p> <p>This change seems to have been made in response to the Clean Coalition’s stated concerns about the lack of teeth in reaching the 2020 goals because the new 2024 requirement acts as a backstop against any deferrals from prior to 2020, which we specifically raised as a concern in our opening comments.</p> <p>The FD states: “Clean Coalition is less</p> | <p>Verified, except that the correct page citations to the Final Decision are to pages 43, 41 and 42-43 respectively. In the future, for consistency, Clean Coalition should cite to the PDF version of documents when possible.</p> |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>headline procurement targets are at significant risk of not being met by 2020. Considering that the IOUs have already expressed their disagreement with the procurement targets, it is likely that the IOUs will continue to be opposed to procurement of the full targets. As such, we urge the Commission to require that the IOUs meet, at the very least, the 2020 procurement target if cost-effective and viable storage projects have been offered in sufficient quantities.” (Clean Coalition opening comments on PD, p. 6).</p> | <p>favorable about the concept of deferring a portion of the IOU’s procurement target. It warns that when utilities have been offered discretion, they have generally procured ‘less than the targets—sometimes significantly less.’ Consequently, it is concerned that the proposal would lead to a similar less than optimal response with respect to actual energy storage procurement.<sup>1</sup>”</p> <p>The FD disagreed with our recommendation in this regard, however, stating (p. 37): “In this decision, we adopt a program that balances ratepayer protection with the promotion of new energy storage technologies. If the utilities can demonstrate that they have not received bids that are economically or operationally viable, or have not received sufficient bids to meet their procurement targets, they will be allowed to defer up to 80 percent of their procurement target to a later procurement period. At the same time, there shall be a minimum level of procurement for each solicitation period to ensure that energy storage is included in a utility’s resource portfolio.”</p> <p>In sum, the FD disagreed with our recommendation to increase the bar for allowed deferrals but agreed with our recommendation that a backstop deadline for full procurement of the 1,325 MW goal should be added to the procurement framework.</p> |   |
| <p><b><i>Procurement mechanisms</i></b></p> <p>Clean Coalition argued in favor of a full cost and value pricing approach. We stated in opening comments on the ACR (p. 9):</p> <p>“The Clean Coalition feels that the cost-effectiveness tools developed in this proceeding may provide the appropriate basis for “off ramps” and ratepayer</p>   | <p><i>The FD states (p. 48): “Other parties opposed to the RAM promote other approaches. For example, Primus Power advocates a feed-in tariff structure, Joint Solar Parties recommend RFOs, and Clean Coalition proposes full cost and value pricing.”</i></p> <p>The FD agreed with our argument that the RAM was not appropriate for energy</p>  | <p>Verified, except that the correct page citations to the Final Decision are to pages 54 and 54-55 respectively.</p> |

<sup>1</sup> Clean Coalition’s Opening Comments on ACR at 6.

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p>protection. We propose a Full Cost and Value Accounting approach, using the analyses developed by EPRI and DNV KEMA, under which the Commission, utilities and other stakeholders will create standard process for evaluating storage projects and standard value figures for a comprehensive set of the various services provided by storage facilities.”</p> <p>We also stated our opposition to using RAM in the energy storage context, in opening comments on the ACR at p. 4:</p> <p>“The ACR proposes using a RAM-like model for procuring third-party owned energy storage (p. 16). We are concerned that a RAM model won’t be able to accommodate the technology diversity in today’s energy storage market. We also question whether a RAM procurement mechanism would allow third-party owners to maximize the value of several revenue streams for different types of services that storage can provide.”</p> | <p>storage, but did not agree with our preferred alternative proposal: full cost and value pricing. The FD states (p. 48): “We agree with parties that the RAM is not the appropriate mechanism for the procurement of energy storage. Energy storage has multiple attributes and functions that cross the spectrum of wholesale and retail markets and transmission &amp; distribution grid services. As such, a RAM-type solicitation, which seeks to obtain the lowest cost for ratepayers, may not be able to properly evaluate projects due to the variety of functions and markets served. Rather, we are persuaded by parties’ comments that competitive solicitations involving RFOs are the best mechanism to meet the varying definitions and use cases of storage in a changing technology environment.”</p> |   |
| <p><b><i>Party Participation in development of common framework for cost-effectiveness</i></b></p> <p>Clean Coalition argued (p. 8-9, opening comments on PD): “The Clean Coalition requests that the Commission include parties to this proceeding as potential members of the joint consultation between the IOUs and Commission staff to establish a common framework for the IOUs for “valuing storage benefits such as market services and avoided costs, and estimating project costs to provide a consistent basis for comparison across utilities, bids,</p>   | <p><i>The Commission agreed partially with our recommendation, giving permission to Energy Division to hold a workshop to discuss the “evaluation protocol.” This did not go as far as we would have liked, but it was a step in the right direction to providing at least some stakeholder participation in what would have otherwise been an opaque process with no stakeholder participation.</i></p> <p>The FD states (p. 55-56): “In addition, while we allow different evaluation protocols by utility, the IOUs shall confer with Energy Division Staff to develop a consistent evaluation protocol to be used for benchmarking and general reporting purposes. Energy Division staff may hold a</p>   | <p>Verified, except that the correct page citation to Clean Coalition’s Opening Comments on the PD is to pages 9-10, and the correct page citation to the Final Decision is to page 63.</p> |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p>and use cases.” (Appendix, p. 6). This is a highly important part of the process and it would contravene the spirit of the rule-making process to not allow parties to be part of the development of this common framework. In fact, it is perhaps the most important part of the proceeding and it is being deferred. We accept this deferral but we strongly recommend including other parties in the process of completing the common framework.”</p> | <p>public workshop to discuss the consistent evaluation protocol with stakeholders before the IOUs file their procurement applications.”</p>  |  |
| <p><b><i>Customer-side procurement of energy storage</i></b></p> <p>Clean coalition argued that customer-side procurement of energy storage should be eliminated (Clean Coalition’s Opening Comments on ACR at 12)</p>  | <p>The FD states (p. 51): “IREC and Clean Coalition recommend eliminating or reducing the MW target for customer-side procurement.”</p> <p>The Commission disagreed with our recommendation, stating (p. 51): “We are persuaded by PG&amp;E’s arguments that customer-side storage targets may be fulfilled through existing proceedings, such as the 2015 demand response application, the distributed generation/California Solar Initiative rulemaking, and alternative-fueled vehicle rulemaking. All of these proceedings have their own standards that are being used to develop and implement programs.”</p> | <p>Verified, except that the correct page citations to the Final Decision are to pages 57 and 58 respectively.</p> |
| <p><b><i>Determining cost-effectiveness</i></b></p> <p>“We recommend at this time that any storage projects that can be procured under our proposed standard values approach (Full Cost and Value Accounting) should be deemed cost-effective.” (Clean Coalition’s Opening Comments on ACR at 12)</p>   | <p><i>The FD states: “Other parties advocate other means to determine cost-effectiveness. Sierra/CEJA urge the Commission to “make a finding that the procurement targets met the cost effectiveness of AB 2514.” Clean Coalition advocates a “Full Cost and Value Accounting Approach” which would calculate standard value pricing numbers that would be available for each service that storage technologies provide. Clean Coalition states that under its proposed approach, developers would bid their projects based on standard value pricing, which are deemed to be cost-effective.”</i></p>              | <p>Verified, except that the correct page citation to the Final Decision is to page 61.</p>                        |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   | <p>The FD did not, however, agree with our recommended Full Cost and Value Accounting approach, stating (p. 55): “We agree with parties that any actual finding of cost-effectiveness should only be done in a utility application for approval of storage contracts or rate-based additions, where there is a specific project and actual project inputs. Moreover, based on parties’ comments, we find that the EPRI and DNV KEMA models should not be required by the Commission as the sole methodologies for assessing cost effectiveness at this point. As such, we shall allow the IOUs to propose their own methodology to evaluate the cost and benefits of bids. However, the IOUs shall assess the full range of benefits and costs identified in the use-case framework and the EPRI and DNV KEMA reports submitted in this proceeding.”</p> |   |
| <p><b><i>Confidentiality issues</i></b></p> <p>The Clean Coalition highlighted problems with the Commission’s interpretation of relevant confidentiality provisions at length in our comments on the PD.</p> <p>We stated in opening comments on the PD (p. 11), extending through page 14:</p> <p>“The Clean Coalition strongly disagrees with the PD’s citation to D.06-06-066 re confidentiality in the context of the value of the various products from energy storage projects. The Clean Coalition has long been concerned about confidentiality and the tendency to enforce a presumption of confidentiality rather than the actual presumption of non-confidentiality codified in Commission precedent. While our comments here are limited to the energy storage context, our</p> | <p><i>The Commission disagreed with our comments on confidentiality and the proper interpretation of D.06-06-066.</i></p> <p>The FD states (p. 57): “Based on parties’ comments, we are persuaded that the confidentiality rules in the Storage Framework should be consistent with the confidentiality requirements set forth in D.06-06-066. That decision established a matrix that identified various types of utility data and the extent and duration to which that data would receive confidential treatment. Although storage is not specifically identified in Appendix 1 of that decision, we are not persuaded that it is unique enough to warrant differential treatment of its data compared to other technologies and applications being procured by utilities at this time.”</p>  | <p>Verified, except that the correct page citation to the Final Decision is to page 65.</p> |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| general concerns extend to the treatment of data confidentiality in all domains regulated by the Commission.” |  |  |
|---|--|--|

**B. Duplication of Effort (§§ 1801.3(f) & 1802.5):**

|  | <b>Claimant</b> | <b>CPUC Verified</b>   |
|--|-----------------|--|
| <b>a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?<sup>2</sup></b>   | <b>Yes</b>      | Correct  |
| <b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</b>  | <b>Yes</b>      | Correct  |
| <b>c. If so, provide name of other parties: PG&amp;E, SCE, SDG&amp;E, MEA, TURN, CESA, Pilot Power, Megawatt Storage, IEP, Sierra/CEJA, and CFC</b>  |                 | Correct. There were also many other parties to the proceeding.             |
| <b>d. Describe how you coordinated with ORA and other parties to avoid duplication or how your participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party:</b><br><br>The Clean Coalition’s compensation in this proceeding should not be reduced for duplication of the showings of other parties. The Clean Coalition often led the efforts to coordinate with other parties, including joint comments, collaborative conversations regarding use cases and internal coordination with the Long Term Procurement Proceeding, as directed by the Commission early in this proceeding. In short, no party represents the arguments that the Clean Coalition regularly advocates: a quick transition to more wholesale distributed generation and a smarter grid to accommodate more renewables. We collaborated with other parties when possible. |                 | Correct. We make no reductions to Clean Coalition’s claim for duplication. |

<sup>2</sup> The Division of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Office of Ratepayer Advocates effective September 26, 2013, pursuant to Senate Bill No. 96 (Budget Act of 2013: public resources), which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.



**C. Additional Comments on Part II:****PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION****A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§§ 1801 & 1806):**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>a. Concise explanation as to how the cost of Claimant’s participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation</b></p> <p>This proceeding and final decision benefitted from the Clean Coalition’s participation, particularly from our use case comments and recommendations on the proposed procurement framework. We stressed that the law requires that energy storage procured by utilities under this procurement framework must be cost-effective. We also recommended ways in which the Commission could ensure cost-effectiveness. Our recommendations, if accepted, would have achieved this goal. Because the Commission did not accept our recommended cost-effectiveness framework we cannot quantify the impacts of our recommendations on ratepayers. However, we feel that the cost of our participation is more than outweighed by the benefits of our participation. No other group represents the issues that the Clean Coalition brings forth to the Commission, and these issues were taken into consideration and evaluated in the Final Decision, as described in the previous section.</p> | <p><b>CPUC Verified</b></p> <hr/> <p>Correct, after the adjustments made in this decision.</p>                      |
| <p><b>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.</b></p> <p>The Clean Coalition was always careful in terms of using the most appropriate personnel for each task. We worked to ensure that only personnel essential to these matters worked on each issue. Director of Economics and Policy Analysis Kenneth Sahm White and Intelligent Grid Policy Manager Whitney Richardson took the lead in drafting comments and leading collaboration with other parties on most issues in this proceeding. Regulatory Policy Director Stephanie Wang and Attorney Tam Hunt provided some oversight of comments, and Hunt assumed the lead role in submitting comments when Richardson left the Clean Coalition. Project Engineer Bob O’Hagan provided support for the use case submission and evaluation. Policy Manager Dyana Delfin-Polk assisted minimally and prepared the compensation claim. In addition, the Clean Coalition staff efficiently coordinated with groups in this proceeding to minimize time and resources required.</p>   | <p>After the adjustments made in this decision, the remaining hours are reasonable and warrant compensation.</p>    |
| <p><b>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue</b></p> <p>In terms of allocation of time between issues in this proceeding, there were several overarching issues that Clean Coalition focused upon: the need for the Commission to seriously evaluate and use DG distributed generation resources, providing the Commission a well-developed use case example, ensuring an effective procurement framework with teeth, ensuring cost-effectiveness, and ensuring that California’s energy storage procurement goals are met, all of which are well within the scope of this proceeding. The Clean Coalition spent the majority of time and effort on these particular issues, as is represented in the record, and in leading collaborative efforts with other groups.</p>   | <p>Verified, except the hourly allocation of hours to issues was quite broad (e.g., there were few categories).</p> |

**B. Specific Claim:\***

| CLAIMED   |      |       |               |                    |            | CPUC AWARD               |                      |            |
|---|------|-------|---------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------|
| ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES   |      |       |               |                    |            |                          |                      |            |
| Item  | Year | Hours | Rate \$       | Basis for Rate*    | Total \$   | Hours                    | Rate \$              | Total \$   |
| Tam Hunt  | 2013 | 38.25 | \$336         | Resolution ALJ-287 | \$12,852   | 23.3                     | \$345 [1]            | \$8,038.50 |
| Stephanie Wang  | 2013 | 32.5  | \$305         | Resolution ALJ-287 | \$9,912.5  | 31.0                     | \$305 <sup>3</sup>   | \$9,455.00 |
| Kenneth Sahm White  | 2012 | 16.75 | \$175         | Resolution ALJ-281 | \$2,931.25 | 11.5                     | \$280 <sup>4</sup>   | \$3,220.00 |
| Kenneth Sahm White  | 2013 | 4.75  | \$185         | Resolution ALJ-287 | \$878.75   | 4.5                      | \$285 <sup>5</sup>   | \$1,282.50 |
| Bob O’Hagan   | 2012 | 30.5  | \$165         | Resolution ALJ-281 | \$5,032.5  | 29.0                     | \$165[2]             | \$4,785.00 |
| Whitney Richardson  | 2012 | 97    | \$95          | Resolution ALJ-281 | \$9,215    | 70.3                     | \$ 95 <sup>6</sup>   | \$6,678.50 |
| Dyana Delfin-Polk   | 2013 | 12.5  | \$95          | Resolution ALJ-287 | \$1,187.5  | 5.5                      | \$85 <sup>7</sup>    | \$467.50   |
| Subtotal: \$ 42,009.5   |      |       |               |                    |            | Subtotal: \$ 33,927.00   |                      |            |
| INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **  |      |       |               |                    |            |                          |                      |            |
| Item  | Year | Hours | Rate \$       | Basis for Rate*    | Total \$   | Hours                    | Rate                 | Total \$   |
| Dyana Delfin-Polk   | 2012 |       |               |                    |            | 3                        | \$40 [6]             | \$120.00   |
| Dyana Delfin-Polk   | 2013 | 7.4   | \$47.5 (half) | Resolution ALJ-287 | \$351.5    | 7.4                      | \$42.50 <sup>8</sup> | \$314.50   |
| Tam Hunt  | 2013 | 2     | \$168 (half)  | Resolution ALJ-287 | \$336      | 2                        | \$172.50 [1]         | \$345.00   |
| Subtotal: \$687.5   |      |       |               |                    |            | Subtotal: \$779.50       |                      |            |
| TOTAL REQUEST: \$42,697   |      |       |               |                    |            | TOTAL AWARD: \$34,706.50 |                      |            |
| *We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor’s records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants, and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. |      |       |               |                    |            |                          |                      |            |

<sup>3</sup> See D.14-12-075 at 15.<sup>4</sup> See D.13-12-023.<sup>5</sup> Application of 2% COLA approved in Res. ALJ-287.<sup>6</sup> See D.14-12-075 at 14.<sup>7</sup> *Id.*<sup>8</sup> *Id.*

The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.

\*\*Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate.

| Attorney       | Date Admitted to CA BAR <sup>9</sup> | Member Number | Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?)<br>If "Yes", attach explanation  |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|--|
| Tamlyn Hunt    | 1/29/2002                            | 218673        | No; However, from January 1, 2005 until April 27, 2009, Hunt was an inactive member of the California State Bar. |
| Stephanie Wang | 9/29/2008                            | 257437        | No   |

### C. CPUC Disallowances, Adjustments, and Comments:

| Item | Reason  |
|------|---|
| 1    | The Commission previously approved a 2012 hourly rate for Tam Hunt representing the Clean Coalition of \$340. When applying the 2% cost-of-living adjustment authorized by Resolution ALJ-287, we award Hunt a 2013 hourly rate of \$345 for this proceeding.   |
| 2    | D.14-12-075 at 14 awarded Robert O'Hagan a 2013 hourly rate of \$165, noting that he has 12 years of experience in the engineering and energy fields respectively, and citing his resume. The Clean Coalition has submitted O'Hagan's resume with this request as well. The 2012 requested hourly rate of \$165 is still at the low range for someone with O'Hagan's years of experience and we grant this \$165 hourly rate for 2012. See Resolution ALJ-281.  |
| 3    | We reduce the hours claimed by Tam Hunt in 2013 by 6.75 for time spent on drafting reply comments on the storage ACR because Clean Coalition does not list these reply comments as a document filed in this proceeding (in Part II.A above) and we cannot find these comments on the docket card. We also reduce Hunt's 2013 hours by 3 for time claimed for attending a July 15, 2013 energy storage interconnection workshop as that is not a workshop listed in D.13-10-040 at 5.  |
| 4    | We reduce the 2012 hours claimed by Kenneth Sahm White by 4.75 for hours spent to draft comments and edits (apparently to a PD) because this work did not contribute to D.13-10-040.  |
| 5    | We reduce by 23 hours the 2012 hours claimed by Whitney Richardson for writing comments and reply comments (and reading opening comments) on a July 2012 PD, because this work is apparently with respect to D.12-08-016, and not D.13-10-040 for which contribution is claimed.  |
| 6    | <p>We reduce Dyana Delfin-Polk's hours claimed on June 3 and 4, 2012 to draft and finalize the motion for party status by 2 hours because the hours claimed are excessive for the motion in question and work for clerical tasks ("filed and served") is claimed. We do not grant compensation for clerical tasks.</p> <p>We also reduce the time claimed in 2013 for hours spent in 2012 (October 4, 2012; 5 hours claimed) for drafting, etc., of the NOI by 2 hours, and transfer the remaining hours (3 hours) for compensation at rate of intervenor compensation claim preparation in 2012. Therefore, the 2013 claim is reduced by 5 hours, but a new 2012 entry for intervenor compensation claim</p> |

<sup>9</sup> This information may be obtained at: <http://www.calbar.ca.gov/>.

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | preparation for three hours is awarded at half the hourly rate of Delfin-Polk for 2012. (See D.14-12-075 awarding an hourly rate of \$80 for Delfin-Polk's 2012 work.)   |
| 7 | The Clean Coalition did not segregate its hours based on the issues set forth in Part II.A but rather on a broader basis. Clean Coalition did not prevail on the legal issue concerning confidentiality and we reduce Tam Hunt's 2013 hours by 4 hours as an approximation of the time spent on this item.   |
| 8 | The Clean Coalition also did not prevail on its proposal on full cost and value pricing. Because other issues in which Clean Coalition substantially contributed are intermingled with this issue, and for similar reasons as set forth in number 7 above, we reduce all hours except Delfin-Polk's by 5% (after the reductions set forth above) to reflect this item. |

#### **PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?</b>  | No  |
| <b>B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(2)(6))?</b> | Yes |

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. Clean Coalition has made a substantial contribution to D.13-10-040.
2. The requested hourly rates for Clean Coalition's representatives, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$34,706.50.

#### **CONCLUSION OF LAW**

The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

#### **ORDER**

1. Clean Coalition is awarded \$34,706.50.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company shall pay Clean Coalition their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2013 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate

earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning March 4, 2014, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of Clean Coalition's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, at San Francisco, California.

**APPENDIX****Compensation Decision Summary Information**

|                                  |  |                              |
|----------------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| <b>Compensation Decision:</b>    |  | <b>Modifies Decision?</b> No |
| <b>Contribution Decision(s):</b> | D1310040   |                              |
| <b>Proceeding(s):</b>            | R1012007   |                              |
| <b>Author:</b>                   | ALJ Yip-Kikugawa; ALJ Kersten  |                              |
| <b>Payer(s):</b>                 | Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company |                              |

**Intervenor Information**

| <b>Intervenor</b> | <b>Claim Date</b> | <b>Amount Requested</b> | <b>Amount Awarded</b> | <b>Multiplier</b> | <b>Reason Change/Disallowance</b>  |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| Clean Coalition   | 12/19/13          | \$42,697.00             | \$34,706.50           | n/a               | Adjustment of hourly rate; disallowance for issues for which no substantial contribution was made; reduction for excessive hours and clerical tasks. |

**Advocate Information**

| <b>First Name</b> | <b>Last Name</b> | <b>Type</b> | <b>Intervenor</b> | <b>Hourly Fee Requested</b> | <b>Year Hourly Fee Requested</b> | <b>Hourly Fee Adopted</b> |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Tam               | Hunt             | Attorney    | Clean Coalition   | \$336                       | 2013                             | \$345                     |
| Stephanie         | Wang             | Attorney    | Clean Coalition   | \$305                       | 2013                             | \$305                     |
| Kenneth Sahm      | White            | Expert      | Clean Coalition   | \$175                       | 2012                             | \$280                     |
| Kenneth Sahm      | White            | Expert      | Clean Coalition   | \$185                       | 2013                             | \$285                     |
| Robert            | O'Hagan          | Expert      | Clean Coalition   | \$165                       | 2012                             | \$165                     |
| Whitney           | Richardson       | Paralegal   | Clean Coalition   | \$95                        | 2012                             | \$95                      |
| Dyana             | Delfin-Polk      | Paralegal   | Clean Coalition   | n/a                         | 2012                             | \$80                      |
| Dyana             | Delfin-Polk      | Paralegal   | Clean Coalition   | \$95                        | 2013                             | \$85                      |

**(END OF APPENDIX)**